...ates
...ent of
...re
Office of
Governmental
and Public Affairs

Major News Releases and Speeches

Nov. 12 - Nov. 19, 1982

IN THIS ISSUE:

Speeches—
Remarks prepared for delivery by Secretary of Agriculture John R. Block before the Tobacco Growers Association's Annual Meeting in Raleigh, N.C., Nov. 19, 1982

News Releases—
Farmer Cooperative Business Hits New Annual High of $71.5 Billion

USDA Sees No Practical Way of Limiting Sugarcane Smut By Quarantine

Tobacco Producers to Contribute to No-Net-Cost Fund

USDA Seeks Comments on Proposed Change in Dry Whole Milk Standards

USDA Searches Central New Jersey for Foreign Fly that Carries Cattle Parasite

USDA to Permit Price Support Loans on Substituted Grain, Soybeans

Block Names Farmer to Head Soybean Research Advisors

Use Care in Buying Fresh Turkeys for the Holidays

USDA Seeks Views on Lemon Proposal

USDA Proposes New Rules on User Fees for Tobacco Reports

Food Stamp Recipients Meet Dietary Standards for Many Nutrients, USDA Says

Speeches

U.S. Department of Agriculture • Office of Governmental and Public Affairs

Remarks prepared for delivery by Secretary of Agriculture John R. Block at the dedication of the USDA Human Nutrition Research Center for Aging, Tufts University, Boston, Mass., Nov. 5, 1982

I appreciate your giving me this opportunity to discuss some of the important issues involving agriculture as a whole. . .and your industry in particular.

I must admit that back home in central Illinois, tobacco wasn't exactly a subject that stimulated a lot of conversation around the grain elevator. But it didn't take long for me to get briefed on a lot of the specifics, thanks to the many knowledgeable people who work at the U.S. Department of Agriculture. And because of a strong working relationship with your distinguished senator—Jesse Helms—I also learned that the attitude in the tobacco industry wasn't really that different from the corn farmer, or anyone else involved in agriculture.

The commodity may be planted differently. . .the production figures are different than corn or soybeans. . .it's marketed somewhat differently. . .but the values and goals of agriculture are all still the same. The concepts of market-oriented agriculture—the foundation of our strength—are held just as strongly by all of us, regardless of what we produce, or where we produce it.

If you know anything at all about Jack Block, then you know that I carried a lot of market-oriented agriculture ideas with me when I packed my suitcase and moved to Washington. Everything that I do—every decision that I make—is targeted towards getting U.S. agriculture back on a market footing. And if you look closely at many of our farm programs, you will realize they are designed to lead us in that direction.

I'm certain that you, as tobacco growers, share my vision of the day when we can put all our problems behind us. But you also realize we've got a lot of work to do before that day comes. That means we have some serious matters to talk about.

Actually, I can make the same comments about the tobacco price support program that I have about the dairy program. I firmly support

the need for the program. . .as long as it achieves what it was intended to do. . .nothing more.

With thousands of producers and a handful of multinational tobacco manufacturers, it's imperative that we have a structure that provides buyers an adequate supply at reasonable prices, while providing producers a fair return. But, look at what happened.

The rising support levels have moved U.S. tobacco prices substantially above those of most competing suppliers. Competing nations have garnered most of the increase in world trade while the U.S. share has declined over the past 25 years. And even in the U.S.—flue-cured imports have jumped from three percent of the domestic market in 1974 to around 13 percent in 1981.

I doubt whether the authors of these support programs could ever have invisioned the United Kingdom—once the dominant market for our tobacco—shifting to other suppliers as they have. Could they have ever anticipated that the U.S.—the largest exporter of tobacco—would also become the world's leading importer by 1982?

I realize that your association is concerned about the 260 million pounds of tobacco that the stabilization corporation received under loan this season. At 26 percent of the crop, that is the largest share of loan receipts in stabilization's 37-year history.

You are also certainly concerned that the 1982 crop represents a loan investment of over $500 million and carrying costs of at least $50 million a year, at current interest rates. And with the No Net Cost Tobacco Program Act of 1982, Congress intends that producers contribute to a no net cost account to assure that the price support program operates at no net cost to taxpayers.

That's what makes the situation so difficult. With the growers contributions in 1982 being considerably below the amount needed to ensure that the '82 crop is sold at no net cost to taxpayers, it is very likely that stabilization will have to request that we approve, for the 1983 crop, an increase in the contribution rate.

Even with the revisions made in the price support formula, demand has continued to decline. And starting with the 1982 crop, you, as growers, are required to subsidize any losses that may occur in handling stabilization's inventory.

Right now we are in the process of deciding on the size of the 1983 marketing quota. Many of you requested that we maintain the quota and also freeze the support level for a couple years. I realize that each of you want to maintain or increase the size of your operation to pay for your investment. The trouble is that we are only adding to the problem. We'd be approaching a day of reckoning that could be too much for us to handle.

As you know, the administration favored enactment of the no net cost tobacco program. We considered it a positive first step toward dealing with the problem. But we told the Congress in our legislative report that the discretion to adjust support levels was very narrow and may not be enough to allow USDA to meet the no net cost objective specified in the Agriculture and Food Act of 1981.

The 1982 law allows us to reflect at least 65 percent of the support formula increase in the support level. And the modest reduction—35 percent of the increase—can occur when we find that the supply of a particular tobacco is likely to be excessive.

By our estimates, we felt we were turning the corner and would have the industry headed in the right direction—a direction in which it would eventually find stability in the market. But it didn't work that way.

We have to face the cold, hard facts. The reality of the situation is that we have a price support level that has been completely overtaken by competing countries. We are in a world market where trade is a two-way street. As long as buyers have other tobaccos that provide the desired quality in relation to price, the long-term outlook for our markets are not favorable.

The law requires us to attempt an orderly reduction of the excess supply. We will announce our decision by Dec. 1, and then later in December allotment holders will will vote on a referendum for or against marketing quotas for the 1983 through '85 crops.

At the same time, we are prepared to work with all industry groups and the Congress as program alternatives are recommended. The key is to work together towards the goals that we all believe in.

We all believe in a free agriculture, with the least amount of government involvement. We've learned the hard way that the government doesn't stimulate agriculture for very long by giving it free

handouts. Nor does the government stimulate farmers by placing mandatory restraints on how much they can individually produce.

I'd like to take a minute to read something from what I said more than a year ago in Mississippi. At that time I said, ". . .allotment programs have played a major role during the history of agriculture in the South. But, they do not play a role in market-oriented agriculture as we see it today. When you come right down to it, allotments are actually 'rights' given by the government to grow a crop.

"The government does not give you rights. You've received those already from the U.S. Constitution. That document gives you the right to produce and to market—and no one else has the right to give it to you or take it away. . . ."

I made that statement in May, 1981. . .and it still holds true today. Any actions we take in government will be designed to help American producers work within the framework of their own rights—not rights given by the government.

I strongly encourage you to join together and help us address the problem. . .and help show the doubters that this industry is willing to take matters into its own hands. It's a challenge for sure—but it can also be an opportunity. Thank you.

#

News Releases

U.S. Department of Agriculture • Office of Governmental and Public Affairs

FARMER COOPERATIVE BUSINESS HITS NEW ANNUAL HIGH OF $71.5 BILLION

WASHINGTON, Nov. 15—Business volume of farmer cooperatives in this country reached a record high of $71.5 billion in 1981, 8 percent above 1980, a U.S. Department of Agriculture official said today.

Randall E. Torgerson, administrator of USDA's Agricultural Cooperative Service, attributed the rise in business volume primarily to larger quantities of farm products marketed by cooperatives. Average prices received by farmers for most commodities were down in 1981.

Other highlights on cooperatives for the year:

— Equity of members and patrons reached $10.9 billion, also a new high.—Total assets of $26.3 billion and net margins of $1.4 billion were down from the previous year.

— The number of cooperatives and cooperative memberships continued a long downward trend.

Total cooperative business volume includes marketing (the value of products sold), farm supplies (sales of fertilizer, chemicals, fuels, feed and other supplies to members and patrons), and receipts from related services such as trucking, storage, ginning and drying.

Torgerson said the drop in number of cooperatives—from 6,293 to 6,211 -was the result of cooperatives reorganizing—mergers, consolidations, acquisitions—and going out of business.

Memberships totaled 5.3 million, down from 5.4 million for the previous year. "This drop of less than 1 percent partly reflects the continuing reduction in the number of farms and partly a continuing trend in mergers and consolidations," Torgerson said. Some farmers belong to more than one cooperative.

Memberships per association averaged 860 in 1981, compared with 855 for 1980.

Marketing volume, at $53.3 billion, was up 8.9 percent from the $48.9 billion in 1980.

Grain, the leading farm product, increased to $19.8 billion, up 11.2 percent. However, marketing for two other products made bigger gains, with rice up 25.4 percent and tobacco up 23.8 percent.

Farm supply volume of $17.1 billion, up 5.7 percent from $16.1 billion in 1980, increased mainly from higher values for petroleum, the leading farm supply, and fertilizer.

Business volume of petroleum products went up 11.4 percent, to $5.6 billion; and fertilizer rose 6.4 percent, to $3.7 billion. Farm chemicals was the largest farm supply gainer, up 21.7 percent.

Value of other services related to farm business remained at $1.2 billion.

More cooperatives were headquartered in Minnesota and North Dakota than in any other state, with 722 and 422 respectively.

States with the largest number of cooperative memberships were Minnesota, 525,709, and Wisconsin, 349,071. Iowa accounted for the largest business volume handled by cooperatives with nearly $7.5 billion. California was second with more than $5.9 billion.

Farmer cooperative assets, eliminating intercooperative investments, totaled $26.3 billion, a 2.5 percent drop from the $26.9 billion in 1980.

Total liabilities dropped from $18.8 billion in 1980 to $17.9 billion, a decrease of 4.8 percent.

Net worth, or member and patron equity, increased 3.1 percent, from $10.6 billion to $10.9 billion.

Member and patron equity financed 37.9 percent of total assets in 1981, up from 36 percent in 1980. The increased share of member and patron equity financing total assets appears to result from reductions in current assets, principally inventories and accounts receivable, reductions in current liabilities, and an actual increase in member and patron equity.

Cooperatives' net margins were more than $1.4 billion, a 25.9 percent drop from the $1.9 billion in 1980. The $1.4 billion included intercooperative dividends and refunds of $558 million. This was a 3.1 percent increase, compared with the 1980 intercooperative dividends and refunds of $541 million.

"Information was collected on the number of full-time employees of cooperatives for the first time since 1957," Torgerson said.

Farmer cooperatives employed 204,000 full-time employees, compared with 141,000 in 1957. Farm supply cooperatives accounted for 80,000 employees. Full-time employees in marketing cooperatives

totaled 122,000. By commodity, dairy cooperatives had 39,000 full-time employees, while grain cooperatives accounted for 33,000.

#

USDA SEES NO PRACTICAL WAY OF LIMITING SUGARCANE SMUT BY QUARANTINE

WASHINGTON, Nov. 15—U.S. Department of Agriculture officials said today they have found sugarcane smut to be so widespread that emergency regulations against the fungus disease have been withdrawn.

Thomas J. Lanier, a plant protection official of USDA's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, said surveys have shown sugarcane smut to occur throughout all sugarcane producing areas.

"At this time we see no practical way of limiting sugarcane smut by existing emergency regulations or through proposed quarantines," he said.

Sugarcane is grown commercially in Florida, Hawaii, Louisiana, Puerto Rico and Texas.

Sugarcane smut emergency regulations were first imposed in November 1978 on affected products and equipment in Hawaii and in Glades, Hendry, Martin and Palm Beach Counties, Fla. The final quarantine was proposed Feb. 8, 1980.

Withdrawing the proposed quarantine and ending the emergency regulations became effective Nov. 12.

Public comments may be submitted, pending final review, until Jan. 11 to Thomas J. Lanier, Assistant Director, Regulatory Services Staff, Plant Protection and Quarantine, APHIS, USDA, Room 643 Federal Building, 6505 Belcrest Rd., Hyattsville, Md. 20782.

#

TOBACCO PRODUCERS TO CONTRIBUTE TO NO-NET-COST FUND

WASHINGTON, Nov. 15—The U.S. Department of Agriculture today implemented provisions of the No Net Cost Tobacco Program

Act of 1982 which require tobacco producers to contribute to a no-net-cost tobacco fund or account as a condition of eligibility for government price support.

Everett Rank, administrator of USDA's Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, said the funds will ensure USDA will not suffer any loss from its tobacco price support programs.

Contributions will be gathered by producer-owned associations that have loan agreements with USDA's Commodity Credit Corporation, Rank said. Money held by the association will be considered a "fund," whereas money held by CCC will be considered an "account."

Rank said most associations have the option of whether to operate a fund or an account. The exception is the flue-cured tobacco association which is required to establish a fund, he said.

Associations are required to determine the size of contributions on a per pound basis and, if USDA determines that total contributions will result in an amount sufficient to reimburse CCC for any losses, USDA will approve the proposal, Rank said.

The No Net Cost Tobacco Program Act allows CCC to retain any net gains from the sale of 1982 and subsequent crops of loan collateral and to use these gains to reduce outstanding balances on any loans made to associations.

Rank said the new legislation also provides that USDA may reduce the support rate which would otherwise be established for grades of any kind of tobacco that likely will be in excess supply. However, he said, if the regular formula in the law requires an increase in the support rate for the tobacco in excess supply and a reduction is contemplated, any reduction cannot lower the increase by more than 35 percent.

Other new price-support eligibility requirements for tobacco producers include the following:

— For the 1983 and subsequent crops, owners of flue-cured tobacco farms who lease and transfer all or any part of a marketing quota from the farm must contribute to the no net cost fund. The contribution per pound of the lessor will equal that of the producer who qualifies for price support on tobacco which he or she produces.

— For the 1983 and subsequent tobacco crops, producers who market tobacco ineligible for price support because they have not agreed to make contributions to funds or accounts, are subject to the

same penalty as for marketing tobacco from a farm in excess of the marketing quota. That penalty is 75 percent of the pevious year's average market price.

Details of today's action are scheduled to appear in the Nov. 16 Federal Register.

Rank said the new regulations are being issued as an interim rule because the marketing season has already begun and there is not enough time to issue a proposed rule for comment. He said public comments on the interim rule are invited until Jan. 17, when it will be reviewed. A final rule will follow that review.

Written comments should be addressed to director, tobacco and peanuts division, USDA-ASCS, P.O. Box 2415, Washington, D.C. 20013. Comments will be available for inspection between 8:15 a.m. and 4:45 p.m. in room 5750 of USDA's South Building.

#

USDA SEEKS COMMENTS ON PROPOSED CHANGE IN DRY WHOLE MILK STANDARDS

WASHINGTON, Nov. 16—Representatives of the dairy industry and the public may comment until Jan. 17 on a U.S. Department of Agriculture proposal that would make changes in the standards for dry whole milk.

Edward T. Coughlin, dairy official with USDA's Agricultural Marketing Service, said the proposal would eliminate the "U.S. Premium" grade standards for dry whole milk. He said that the remaining grades—"U.S. Extra" and "U.S. Standard"—will adequately classify the quality of dry whole milk as it is used now.

Coughlin said this proposal and other minor technical proposals were developed in cooperation with the American Dry Milk Institute.

Production and sales of dry whole milk has shown a steady increase during recent years. Dry whole milk is used in the manufacture of ice cream, candy, soup and baked goods, Coughlin said.

The proposal is scheduled to be published in the Nov. 16 Federal Register. Copies are available from: Dairy Division, AMS, USDA, Washington, D.C. 20250.

Comments should be sent to Hearing Clerk, Rm. 1077-S, USDA, Washington, D.C. 20250, where they will be available to the public.

#

USDA SEARCHES CENTRAL NEW JERSEY FOR FOREIGN FLY THAT CARRIES CATTLE PARASITE

WASHINGTON, Nov. 16—U.S. Department of Agriculture veterinarians and entomologists are searching central New Jersey for a foreign fly which can carry a cattle parasite that destroys the most valuable meat in beef cattle.

Military and state personnel are helping USDA in the survey, according to D. David Wilson of USDA's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

"The foreign fly—Musca vitripennis—can carry a parasite that is not known to exist in this country," Wilson said. "If the parasite—Parafilaria bovicola—were to gain entry, it could be spread by the face fly, which is common in the United States.

"The worm parasite was accidentally introduced into Sweden a few years ago," Wilson said. "There it is causing increasing losses every year in cattle slaughtered for meat.

"The worm can usually be found under the skin of the loin area," Wilson said. "This means that about 15 pounds of the most valuable meat in an infested carcass must be trimmed, as it is unfit for human consumption."

Wilson said one of the foreign flies that carries the parasitic worm was found at McGuire Air Force Base on July 27 during a routine pest control inspection by a USDA entomologist.

Once the fly had been identified—it looks like a common house fly with hairy eyes—USDA conducted a survey of the air base and nearby cattle farms. Of the 70,000 flies caught, none were the foreign pest. However, USDA inspectors found a second male fly at the air base a short time later.

"Thus far," Wilson said, "there is no indication that the foreign fly has established itself in the United States or that those found were

infected with the parasite. We're planning a second survey for the spring of 1983 to make sure."

#

USDA TO PERMIT PRICE SUPPORT LOANS ON SUBSTITUTED GRAIN, SOYBEANS

WASHINGTON, Nov. 17—Farmers who participate in the government's acreage reduction program now will be able to take out government price support loans on grain and soybeans substituted for crops produced on their farms, a high ranking U.S. Department of Agriculture official said today.

Previously, only grain physically grown on a producer's farm was eligible for price support.

Everett Rank, administrator of USDA's Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, said the change was made to allow farmers who participate in acreage reduction programs to take advantage of government price supports without having to transport their grain to areas where grain elevators will accept the grain for storage.

Rank said the change will permit eligible producers to feed or sell grain produced on their farms and place under loan an equivalent quantity of acquired grain stored in an approved warehouse.

Commodities that may be substituted include wheat, feed grains, rice and soybeans.

Rank also announced that:

— Loans will be based on the rate applicable for the county where the loan grain is stored.

— Producers must obtain approval to place under loan any grain which they acquire before an equivalent quantity they produced is sold or otherwise disposed of.

— Warehouse receipts covering the acquired grain must be submitted to the county Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service office as security for the loan within 15 days after the producer's grain is sold or traded.

Rank said, "The farmer-elected county Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation committee has the responsibility to protect the interest of

both the producer and CCC in approving the substitution of grain for loan purposes. Producers who wish to take advantage of this change should contact their county Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service office."

#

BLOCK NAMES FARMER TO HEAD SOYBEAN RESEARCH ADVISORS

WASHINGTON, Nov.17—Patrick J. Quinn, a soybean farmer from Monterey, La., has been named chairman of the Soybean Research Advisory Institute by Secretary of Agriculture John R. Block.

Quinn will chair the group's first meeting Dec. 17 at the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Congress established the advisory institute under a section of the 1981 farm bill. Its purpose is to assess the effectiveness of soybean research in the United States and to evaluate the potential for increasing soybean production in the years ahead.

Quinn said a comprehensive report on soybean production and utilization will be submitted to Congress by March 1.

A director of the American Soybean Association, Quinn is one of 11 members Block named to the advisory group. The group includes soybean producers, research experts from land grant universities and federal agencies and representatives of private industry.

Other members are Billy E. Caldwell, head, department of crop science, North Carolina State University; Michael F. Campbell, manager, protein products development, A.E. Staley Co., Decatur, Ill.; Harry B. Collins, director, soybean research, Delta and Pine Land Co., Scott, Miss.; Duane D. Hacklander, fibers and oils rersearch, USDA's Economic Research Service, Washington, D.C.. Edgar E. Hartwig, research agronomist, USDA's Agricultural Research Service, Stoneville, Miss., John E. Heilman, vice president-engineering, world processing division, Continental Grain Co., New York, N.Y.

Also, Werner L. Nelson, senior vice president, Potash and Phospate Institute, West Lafayette, Ind.; John F. Sharp, G & S Farms, Grand Bay, Ala., Keith J. Smith, research director, American Soybean

Association, St. Louis, Mo.; Leamon D. Williams, vice president-research, Central Soya Co., Inc., Fort Wayne, Ind.

Robert C. Leffel, national research program leader responsible for breeding and production of soybeans in the USDA's Agricultural Research Service, is the advisory institute's executive secretary.

#

USE CARE IN BUYING FRESH TURKEYS FOR THE HOLIDAYS

WASHINGTON, Nov. 18—Because frozen foods are commonplace, we sometimes forget some of the precautions we should take when buying a fresh product.

A traditional and favorite food during the Thanksgiving and Christmas holiday seasons is a fresh, ready-to-cook whole turkey. Betsy Crosby, a poultry official with the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Agricultural Marketing Service, says consumers should take certain safety precautions when buying fresh turkey.

"Fresh turkey is perishable," Crosby says. "You should take it home promptly, put it into the refrigerator immediately and cook it within two days."

When buying fresh turkey, place an order with the store ahead of time so the fresh turkey you want will be available. Crosby says consumers buying fresh turkeys should probably expect to pay a little more because of the special handling involved and supply.

"The grocer normally takes a greater risk with fresh turkeys because they are more perishable," she says. "Also, because there are fewer fresh turkeys available than frozen ones, fresh turkeys often cost more."

Regardless of whether you buy a fresh or frozen turkey it's important that all turkey be properly handled and prepared, Crosby said.

#

USDA SEEKS VIEWS ON LEMON PROPOSAL

WASHINGTON, Nov. 18—Lemon growers, handlers and the public have until Dec. 17 to give the U.S. Department of Agriculture their views on whether the federal marketing order covering lemons grown in California and Arizona should be amended.

Donald Kuryloski, a marketing official with USDA's Agricultural Marketing Service, said anyone may suggest changes in the proposal or submit new proposals. If other proposals are submitted, the section of the order to which they relate should be referenced, he said.

The proposed changes were suggested by the Lemon Administrative Committee, which works with USDA in administering the marketing order program. The major proposals would:

— Change the annual start of the fiscal year from Aug. 1 to Sept. 1;

— Provide for an additional alternate for each handler member on the committee;

— Limit the number of terms of office a member may serve;

— Change the basis for nominations of committee members by cooperative marketing organizations;

— Provide for an increase in the maximum amount of compensation for committee members;

— Revise handler prorate base adjustment procedures;

— Modify allotment loan procedures;

— Redefine prorate districts 1 and 2 of the production area; and

— Provide for a periodic grower referendum on continuance of the marketing order.

Kuryloski said USDA eventually may hold a public hearing on the proposed amendments. USDA would make its recommended decision after considering public comments and exceptions. To become effective, the amendments would have to be approved by the affected growers in a referendum.

Copies of the proposal are available from Roland G. Harris, Los Angeles Marketing Field Office, AMS, USDA, 845 S. Figueroa St., Suite 540, Los Angeles, Calif. 90017; phone (213) 688-3190, or William J. Doyle, rm. 2532-S, AMS, USDA, Washington, D.C. 20250; phone (202) 447-5975.

#

USDA PROPOSES NEW RULES ON USER FEES FOR TOBACCO REPORTS

WASHINGTON, Nov. 18—The U.S. Department of Agriculture has proposed charging user fees to all news media for printed tobacco reports containing statistical and market news information, modifying an earlier proposal that would have exempted some segments of the news media from payment of these fees.

Comments on the proposal will be accepted until Dec. 17.

William Manley, an official of USDA's Agricultural Marketing Service, said comments received on a June 16 interim final rule had prompted the new proposal.

Under the previous proposal, general news media, including general-circulation newspapers, news magazines and broadcast outlets, would have been exempted from paying user fees for mailed tobacco reports. The trade press, including newspapers and magazines targeted to organizational or commodity groups, would have been required to pay for the tobacco reports beginning July 1.

"Based on comments from the agricultural trade press," Manley said, "we acknowledge that competing media cannot be easily categorized as general news media or publications serving one audience only.

"We are therefore eliminating the exemption from user fees for news media. However, USDA will continue to provide all media with current information by wire service and automatic telephone answering devices without charge."

Among tobacco reports that will be available by paid subscription are the "Annual Report of Tobacco Statistics" and "Tobacco Stocks," Manley said.

#

FOOD STAMP RECIPIENTS MEET DIETARY STANDARDS FOR MANY NUTRIENTS, USDA SAY

WASHINGTON, Nov. 18—Two nationwide surveys conducted by the U.S. Department of Agriculture show that on the average, food

stamp recipients meet dietary standards for many of the nutrients studied.

According to Eleanor M. Pao of USDA's Human Nutrition Information Service, one study contains data collected on food eaten by people in low-income households from November 1977 through March 1978, and the other contains data collected from November 1979 through March 1980.

For these surveys, Pao said, nutrient intakes were calculated and compared to the recommended dietary allowances published by the National Academy of Sciences in 1980. Both studies included nutrient data for people who were in the food stamp program and those who weren't, but were eligible for the program.

Pao said the surveys show average nutrient intakes of people in low-income households, whether or not they received food stamps, met the recommended allowances for protein, phosphorus, vitamin A value, thiamin, riboflavin, niacin, vitamin B12 and vitamin C. In the first survey, intakes were below the recommended dietary allowances for vitamin B6, magnesium, calcium and iron. These nutrients are often a problem in the population as a whole. In the second survey intakes of all these nutrients improved and iron intakes came the closest to meeting the recommendations.

Caloric intakes of individuals in the United States—according to the spring 1977 basic survey of people of all incomes—averaged 85 percent of the recommended allowances. Caloric intakes of food stamp recipients in the earlier low-income survey—1977-78—averaged 79 percent of the recommended allowances, and in the later low-income survey—1979-80, averaged 85 percent.

About one-third of the individuals from low-income households obtained and ate some of their food away from home. This was slightly less than for people who were not food stamp program participants. Foods eaten away from home contributed an average of 12 to 15 percent of the day's intake of food energy and of each nutrient studied for both food stamp program participants and nonparticipants.

Both survey reports are titled "Food and Nutrient Intakes of Individuals in 1 Day, Low-Income Households." The 1977-78 study is Preliminary Report No. 11; the 1979-80 study is Preliminary Report No. 13. Both are available free, while supplies last, from the Consumer

Nutrition Center, Human Nutrition Information Service, USDA, Hyattsville, Md. 20782.

#